arXiv:physics/0409057v1 [physics.gen-ph] 12 Sep 2004

CIRI/05-smw04

Heuristic approach to a *natural* unification of the Quantum Theory and the General Theory of Relativity

Sanjay M. Wagh
Central India Research Institute,
Post Box 606, Laxminagar,
Nagpur 440 022, India
E-mail:cirinag_ngp@sancharnet.in

(Dated: September 12, 2004)

In non-relativistic as well as in special relativistic quantum theory, *mass* and *charge* are *pure numbers* appearing in various (quantum) operators and admit *any values*, *ie*, values for these quantities are to be prescribed *by hand*. This is, in a theory of probability, understandable since we need to *assume* some *intrinsic* properties of the object we are calculating the probability about. Then, if we *specify*, in some satisfactory manner, mass and charge for a point of the space in a suitable general-relativistic framework, the quantum theoretical framework could, in principle, be *obtainable* within it. Heuristic arguments are presented to show that a *natural unification* of the quantum theory and the general theory of relativity is achievable in this manner.

To be submitted to: General Relativity & Gravitation

Difficulties of cognition of physical phenomena arise only in "constructing" a theory from the results of experiments and observations of the physical world, that is, when attempts are made to establish a consistent cause and effect relation between them. It might then seem necessary to demand that no concept enter a theory which has not been experimentally established, at least to the same degree of accuracy as the experiments to be explained by that theory. This simple demand is, plainly speaking, quite impossible [1] to fulfil. It is therefore necessary to introduce various *concepts* into a physical theory, without justifying them rigorously, and then to allow the experiments to determine the range of their applicability, to decide at what points their revision is necessary. Newton's theory is, now, a classic example of this methodology of Physics.

Newton's ideas are geometric [2] conceptions of *specific mathematical structures or fields* (scalar, vector, tensor functions) defined over the *metrically flat (Euclidean) 3-continuum* and the laws of their spatio-temporal transformations. The underlying metrically flat 3-continuum admits the *same Euclidean metric structure* before and after the (galilean) coordinate transformations. This ever-flat 3-continuum is, in this sense, an *absolute space* in Newton's theory. Furthermore, in Newton's theory, the physical laws for these quantities are mathematical statements form-invariant under galilean coordinate transformations.

Various (*newtonian*) mathematical methods, of Laplace, Lagrange, Euler, Hamilton, Jacobi, Poisson and others [3], hold for these newtonian fields definable on the metrically flat 3-continuum and are consistent with the fact that the underlying flat 3-continuum admits the same metric structure before and after the spatio-temporal transformations of these fields. *This overall is, truly, the sense of any theory being newtonian.*

The spatio-temporal (galilean) transformations under which the newtonian laws are form-invariant are, as opposed to general, *specific* transformations of coordinates. Newton's theory also attaches *physical* meaning to the space coordinates and to the time coordinate. In this theory, the space coordinate describes the physical distance separating physical bodies and the time coordinate describes the reading of a physical clock.

In addition to the above, the (newtonian) temporal coordinate has *universally* the same value for all the spatial locations, *ie*, all synchronized clocks at different spatial locations show and maintain the same time. In other words, the newtonian time coordinate is the *absolute* physical time.

The basic concept of this theoretical framework is, of course, Newton's point-mass that moves along a one-dimensional curve of the metrically ever-flat 3-continuum. In these above *physical* associations of the newtonian theory, it is always tacitly assumed that the interaction of a measuring instrument (observer) and the object (a particle whose physical parameters are being measured) is negligibly small or that the effects of this interaction can be eliminated from the results of observations to obtain, as accurately as desired, the values of these parameters [4] [18].

An issue closely related to the above one is that of the causality. Given initial data, Newton's theory predicts the values of its variables of the point-mass exactly and, hence, assumes strictly causal development of *its* physical world.

But, the question arises of zero rest-mass particles, if any, and Newton's theory cannot describe motion of such particles for obvious reasons:

$$\vec{a} = \frac{\vec{F}}{m}$$

where $\vec{a}$ is the acceleration, $\vec{F}$ is the force causing that acceleration of a newtonian particle of an *inertial* rest-mass m. Clearly, acceleration has no meaning for $m = 0$ in the above equation of the newtonian second law of motion. This above inability is an indication of the limitations of the newtonian theoretical framework.

Then, if a zero rest-mass particle were to exist in reality, and nothing in Newton's theory prevents this, it is immediately clear that we need to "extend" various newtonian conceptions.

Now, light displays phenomena such as umbra-penumbra, diffraction, interference, polarization etc. But, Newton's corpuscular theory needs *unnatural, non-universal*, inter-particle forces to explain these phenomena. That light displays phenomena needing *unnatural* explanations in Newton's theory could, with hindsight, then be interpreted to mean that light needs to be treated as a zero rest-mass particle.

Furthermore, as Lorentz had first realized very clearly, the sources of the newtonian *forces* are the singularities of the corresponding fields defined on the flat 3-continuum. Although unsatisfactory, this nature of the newtonian framework causes no problems of mathematical nature since this distinction is maintainable within the formalism, *ie*, well-defined mathematical procedures for handling this distinction are possible.

Revisions of newtonian concepts were necessary by the beginning of the 20th century. Firstly, efforts to reconcile some experimental results with newtonian concepts failed and associated conceptions led Einstein to Special Theory of Relativity [5]. Secondly, some other experiments, in particular, those related to the wave-particle duality of radiation and matter, both, led to non-relativistic quantum theory [1].

The methods of Non-Relativistic Quantum Field Theory [6] are also similar of nature to the above newtonian methods in that these consider *quantum fields* definable on the metrically flat 3-continuum. For these fields of quantum character, we are of course required to modify the newtonian mathematical methods. The Schrödinger-Heisenberg formalism achieves precisely this. Quantum considerations only change the nature of the mathematical (field) structure definable on the underlying metrically flat 3-continuum. That is, differences in the newtonian and the quantum fields are mathematically entirely describable as such. But, the metrically flat 3-continuum is also, in the above sense, an absolute space in these non-relativistic quantum considerations.

Now, importantly, the "source properties" of physical matter are differently treated in the non-relativistic quantum field theory than in Newton's theory. Mass and electric charge of a physical body appear as pure numbers, *to be prescribed by hand* for a point of the metrically flat 3-continuum, in Schrödinger's equation or, equivalently, in Heisenberg's operators. Quantum theory then provides us the probability of the *location* of the mass and the charge values in certain specific region of the underlying metrically flat 3-continuum. Also, the numerical values of the newtonian variables of the point, such as its linear momentum, energy, angular momentum etc. are prescribed the corresponding probabilities.

However, certain physical variables of the newtonian mass-point acquire *discrete values* in the mathematical formalism of the quantum theory. This discreteness of certain variables is the genuine characteristic of the quantum theory and is a significant departure from their continuous values in Newton's theory.

This quantum theory is fundamentally a theory that divides the physical world into two parts, a part that is a system being observed and a part that does the observation. Therefore, quantum theory always refers to an *observer* who is *external* to the system under observation. The results of the observation, of course, depend in detail on just how this division is made.

But, it must be recognized that classical concepts are not completely expelled from the physical considerations in the quantum theory. On the contrary, in Bohr's words, *it is decisive to recognize that, however far the phenomena transcend the scope of classical physical explanation, the account of all evidence must be expressed in classical terms* [7]. This applies in spite of the fact that classical (newtonian) mechanics does not account for the observations of the microphysical world. (Bohr offers "complementarity of (classical) concepts" as an explanation for this.)

We then also note here that it is not possible to treat zero rest mass particles in the non-relativistic quantum theory. As is well known [6], Schrödinger's equation or Heisenberg's operators of this theory are meaningful only when mass is non-vanishing:

$$\left[-\hbar^2 \frac{\nabla^2}{2m} + V \right] \Psi = \imath\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi$$

where Ψ is Schrödinger's Ψ-function and other symbols have their usual meaning.

Clearly, the relevant operators are meaningful only for $m \neq 0$. Essentially, it is the same limitation as that of Newton's theory. Non-relativistic quantum field theory cannot therefore describe phenomena displayed by light.

But, here, a physical body is described as a non-singular point-particle, not as an extended object. That is, mass and electric charge appearing herein are non-singularly defined only for a point of the metrically always-flat 3-continuum.

Now, with Maxwell's electromagnetism [8], we realize that the *particle* of electromagnetic radiation has zero rest-mass - follows from the special relativistic mass-variation with velocity. Then, in essence, the theory of *special relativity enlarges the galilean group of transformations of the metrically flat 3-continuum and time to the Lorentz group of transformations of the metrically flat 3-continuum and time*, which is also treatable as a metrically flat Minkowski-continuum [19].

Lorentz transformations keep Minkowski metric the same. Then, special relativistic laws for electromagnetic fields (mathematical structures on the metrically flat 4-continuum), Maxwell's equations, are mathematical statements form-invariant under Lorentz transformations.

With Maxwell's equations, we have the "special relativistic laws of motion" for the sources and Maxwell's equations for the (electromagnetic) fields. Then, as long as we treat the sources and the fields separately, problems of mathematical nature do not arise since well-defined mathematical procedures exist to handle these concepts.

Standard mathematical methods then permit us again considerations of classical fields on the metrically flat 4-continuum [3]. The "newtonian" mathematical methods of Hamilton-Jacobi-Poisson hold also for them, now in 4-dimensions, and are consistent with the fact that the flat 4-continuum admits the same metric structure before and after the Lorentz transformations of these fields.

This above is, now, the sense of any theory being classical. The underlying metrically flat 4-spacetime is then an *absolute 4-space* in the sense [20] described herein.

It may now be noted that, for zero rest mass particles, we can ascribe vanishing rest mass to a point of the space (or the spacetime manifold):

$$E^2 = p^2 + m^2$$

A point of the space then has $m = 0$ when $E = p$ and such a point necessarily moves with the speed of light. Then, the Lorentz group allows form-invariant Maxwell's equations describing massless electromagnetic radiation.

The Lorentz transformations under which special relativistic laws are form-invariant are *specific* coordinate transformations. Further, the concepts of *measuring rods* and *clocks* are clearly subject to critical examination and it then becomes clear that the ordinary newtonian these concepts involve the tacit assumption that there exist, in principle, signals that are propagated with an infinite speed. Then, as shown by Einstein, the absolute character of time is now lost completely: initially synchronized clocks at different spatial locations do not keep the same time-value.

However, like with Newton's theory, coordinates have a direct physical meaning in special theory of relativity: spatial coordinates represent the length of a physical measuring rod and temporal coordinate represents the time-duration measured by a physical clock. Although it is the same association of physical character, the Lorentz transformations constitute significant departure from the newtonian concepts since time is no longer the absolute time in special relativity.

But, in such (classical) special relativistic considerations, it is always assumed that the effects of the interaction of a measuring instrument (observer) and the object can be eliminated from the results of observations to obtain, as accurately as desired, the values of various parameters of the object [21]. This is exactly as it was in Newton's theory. Hence, (classical) special relativity assumes strict causality.

Now, quantum fields require suitable equations that are form-invariant under the Lorentz transformations to describe quanta moving close to the speed of light in vacuum. These quantum fields are, once again, mathematical structures definable on the metrically ever-flat 4-dimensional (Minkowski) spacetime.

Methods of special relativistic quantum field theory [9] then handle such *quantum fields* on the metrically ever-flat 4-continuum admitting a Minkowskian metric. For quantum fields, we need to "modify" the classical newtonian mathematical methods. These are appropriate generalizations of those of Schrödinger-Heisenberg methods. This, the Dirac-Schwinger-Tomonaga formalism [9], achieves for the metrically flat minkowskian 4-continuum that which the Schrödinger-Heisenberg formalism achieves for the newtonian 3-space and time. Then, the differences in the classical and the quantum fields are mathematically entirely describable as such. Non-relativistic results are recoverable when the velocities are small compared to the speed of light.

However, the underlying Minkowski spacetime does not change under the (Lorentz) transformations keeping the quantum equations form-invariant and is also, in the earlier sense, an *absolute 4-space* here.

Once again, a physical body is represented in these special relativistic quantum considerations by ascribing in *non-singular* sense the mass and the charge as pure numbers to points of the Minkowski 4-continuum in the corresponding operators. The special relativistic quantum theory then provides us the probability of the *spatial location and temporal instant* of the mass and the charge values in a region of the Minkowski 4-continuum, for all velocities limited by the speed of light in vacuum. The numerical values of other variables of the physical body are also prescribed the corresponding probabilities.

Other massless particles, *eg*, neutrinos, are also allowed in the special relativistic quantum field theory due to the group enlargement from that of the galilean group to the Lorentz group of transformations. It is this group enlargement that permits form-invariant Dirac equation [9]. This group enlargement also permits us the theory of massive spin $\frac{1}{2}$ fermions: as are electrons.

However, as noted before, there is nothing special about the 4-dimensional metrically ever-flat spacetime manifold and the same physics can be described in a $3+1$ fashion without difficulties of mathematical or physical nature.

But, there cannot be any possibility of explaining the origin of "mass" as well as of "charge" in this, quantum or not, special relativistic theory, since these properties of a physical body are the pure numbers to be prescribed *by hand* for the corresponding (classical or quantum) mathematical description [22]. In other words, it is only after we have *specified* the values of mass and charge for a source particle that we can *obtain*, from the mathematical formalisms of these theories, its further dynamics based on the given (appropriate) initial data. Hence, the values of mass and charge are not *obtainable* in these theories.

Clearly, therefore, some new developments are needed here to account for the "origin" of such fundamental properties of matter. It is then also clear that the newtonian and the special relativistic frameworks, both, are not sufficiently general to form the basis for the entire physics.

Now, Lorentz had clearly recognized [10] (p. 155) the notion of the *inertia of the electromagnetic field* that follows from Maxwell's theory of electromagnetism: Maxwell's theory shows that the electromagnetic field possesses inertia which is not the same as that of its source particle.

Lorentz then had a clear conception that inertia (opposition of a physical body to a change in its state of motion) could possess *origin* in the field conception. Just as a person in a moving crowd experiences opposition to a change in motion, a particle (region of concentrated field) moving in a surrounding field experiences opposition to a change in its state of motion. This is Lorentz's conception of the field-origin of inertia.

Now, firstly, the distinction between the source and the field must necessarily be obliterated in any formulation of this conception. In other words, a field is the only basic concept and a particle is a derived concept here. Secondly, the mathematical formulation of this conception is also required to be *intrinsically nonlinear*. Basically, in this conception, the field cannot refer to some linear mathematical structure defined on the non-dynamical metrically ever-flat continuum.

Clearly, solutions of linear equations, *eg*, those of Maxwell's electromagnetism, obey superposition principle, and required number of solutions can be superposed to obtain the solution for any assumed field configuration. But, the sources generating the assumed field configuration continue to be the singularities of the field. Hence, there are no means here of obliterating the distinction between sources and field since the sources are the singularities of the field they generate.

Some non-linear field equations could conceivably possess singularity-free solutions for the field. Solutions of such (non-linear) field equations would also not obey the superposition principle. Then, one could hope that these (non-linear) equations for the field would permit some appropriate treatment of source particles as singularity-free regions of concentrated field energy.

An important question is now that of the appropriate (non-linear) field equations of this overall nature, of obtaining these equations without venturing into meaningless arbitrariness. In fact, this question is not just that of the appropriate nonlinear (partial) differential equations that could serve as the field equations. Rather, this question is of some appropriate non-linear mathematical formalism that need not even possess the character of non-linear (partial) differential equations for the field as a mathematical structure on the underlying continuum. (It is also the issue [23] of whether the most fundamental formalism of physics could have a mathematical structure other than that of the (partial) differential equations.)

Historically, there did not exist with Lorentz any physical guidelines for getting to these non-linear field equations. This, very difficult and lengthy, path to these non-linear equations was completely developed by Einstein alone.

Then, Einstein formulated [24] his ideas for a 4-continuum. The pivotal point of his formulation of the relevant ideas is the equivalence of *inertial* and *gravitational* mass of a physical body, a fact known since Newton's times but which remained only an assumption of Newton's theory.

On the basis of the *equivalence principle*, Einstein then provided us the "curved 4-geometry" as a "physically realizable" entity. His field equations provide then a way of realizing these conceptions of a curved geometry physically. Einstein's (makeshift) field equations of this General Theory of Relativity are form-invariant under general (spacetime) coordinate transformations - the principle of general covariance [11].

To arrive at his formulation of the general theory of relativity, Einstein raised [13] (p. 69) the following two questions: *Of which mathematical type are the variables (functions of the coordinates) which permit the expression of the physical properties of the space ("structure")? Only after that: Which equations are satisfied by those variables?*

He then proceeded to develop this theory in two stages, namely, those dealing with

(a) pure gravitational field, and

(b) general field (in which quantities corresponding somehow to the electromagnetic field occur, too).

The situation (a), the pure gravitational field, is characterized by a symmetric (Riemannian) metric (tensor of rank two) for which the Riemann curvature tensor does not vanish.

For the situation (b), Einstein [13] (p. 73) then set up "preliminary equations" to investigate the usefulness of the basic ideas of general relativity:

$$R_{ij} - \frac{1}{2} R\, g_{ij} = -\kappa\, T_{ij}$$

where R_{ij} denotes the Ricci tensor, R denotes the Ricci scalar, κ denotes a proportionality constant and T_{ij} denotes the energy-momentum tensor of matter. In these equations, the energy-momentum tensor does not contain the energy (or inertia) of the pure gravitational field.

In this connection, Einstein expressed [13] (p. 75) his judgement and concerns about these preliminary equations as: *The right side is a formal condensation of all things whose comprehension in the sense of a field theory is still problematic. Not for a moment, of course, did I doubt that this formulation was merely a makeshift in order to give the general principle of relativity a preliminary closed expression. For it was essentially not anything* more *than a theory of the gravitational field, which was somewhat artificially isolated from a total field of as yet unknown structure.*

This general theory of relativity essentially frees Physics from the association of physical meaning to coordinates and coordinate differences, an assumption implicit in Newton's theory and in special relativity. The formulation of Einstein's (makeshift) field equations however attaches physical meaning to the invariant distance of the curved spacetime geometry and considers it to be a physically exactly measurable quantity.

Through these equations, geometric properties of the spacetime are supposed to be determined by the physical matter. In turn, the spacetime geometry is supposed to tell the physical matter how to move. That is, the geodesics of the spacetime geometry are supposed to provide the law of motion of the physical matter.

Now, we may imagine [11] a *small* perturbation of the *background* spacetime geometry and obtain equations governing these perturbations. We may also consider [11] quantum fields on the *unchanging background* spacetime geometry.

Then, such methods (of perturbative analysis and also of the Quantum Field Theory in Curved Spacetime) are quite similar of nature to methods adopted for either the flat 3-continuum or the flat 4-continuum in that these consider "mathematical fields" definable on the fixed and metrically curved 4-continuum. Keeping the nature of mathematical (field) structures the same, these considerations only change the 4-space which is now a metrically curved "absolute" 4-continuum.

But, as far as Lorentz's or Einstein's conceptions are concerned, these above considerations of a quantum field theory in a curved spacetime or perturbations of a curved spacetime geometry are, evidently, *not* self-consistent since matter fields must affect the background spacetime geometry. But, these are *not* the real issues here.

Without going into further details of its formalism, we note that General Theory of Relativity embodies another significant departure from newtonian concepts since only the concept of *coincidence* in spacetime is accepted uncritically in it [1]. At this point, it is then important to note that this space-time coincidence is *usally* taken to be that of a physical kind. That is, it is usually assumed that the time coordinate is *measurable exactly* and so are the spatial coordinates *measurable exactly* in a measuring arrangement.

But, the interaction between observer and object is then assumed to be negligibly small or that its effects can be eliminated from the results of any measurement. This is then the situation with the *standard formulation of general relativity*, that of Einstein's (makeshift) field equations, even when it has finite speeds for signal propagations. Clearly, these two are then unrelated issues.

But, in microscopic phenomena, the interaction between observer and object causes uncontrollable and large changes in the system being observed. Then, every experiment performed to determine some numerical quantity renders the knowledge

of some others illusory, since the uncontrollable changes caused to the observed system alter the values of these other quantities.

Therefore, Einstein's field equations cannot be applied to microscopic phenomena and, hence, in general, may only serve to approximate the average behavior of physical phenomena. This much is, perhaps, generally recognized.

However, what has mostly gone unnoticed is the fact that Einstein's approach to his vacuum as well as (makeshift) field equations with matter is beset with numerous internal contradictions of serious physical nature [12].

Firstly, Einstein's vacuum field equations are entirely unsatisfactory [12] since these are field equations for the pure gravitational field *without* even a possibility of the equations of motion for the sources of that field.

Certainly, matter cannot be any part of the theory of the vacuum or the pure gravitational field. Then, there cannot be physical objects in considerations of the pure gravitational field, except as sources of such fields. Therefore, it obviously does not make any sense whatsoever to say that the geodesics of such a spacetime, geometry describing a pure gravitational field, provide the law of motion for the material sources.

Now, a material particle is necessarily a spacetime singularity of the pure gravitational field and, hence, mathematically, no equations of motion for it are possible. Then, we have only equations for the pure field but no equations of motion for the sources creating those fields.

But, the vacuum field equations alone are *not enough* to draw any conclusions of physical nature. Without the laws for the motions of sources generating the (vacuum) fields, we have no means of ascertaining or establishing the "causes" of motions of sources. No conclusions of physical nature are therefore permissible in this situation and, thus, the vacuum field equations cannot lead us to physically verifiable predictions.

[Note that this above situation is markedly different from that with special relativity. In special relativity, the background geometry does not possess any *geometric singularity* at any location, but only the (mathematical) fields defined on this geometry can be singular. Then, similar to Newton's theory, situations in special relativity lead us to physically testable predictions.]

Secondly, Einstein's (makeshift) field equations with matter are also not satisfactory [12] from the physical point of view. Recall here that the energy-momentum tensor deals with density and fluxes of particles. Then, unless a definition of what constitutes a particle is, a-priori, available to us, we cannot even construct the energy-momentum tensor for the physical matter. Since a spacetime singularity cannot represent a physical particle, the concept of a particle is *not* available to us in Einstein's approach to makeshift field equations of general relativity. Thus, the energy-momentum tensor is *not* any well-defined concept and, with it, the field equations become ill-posed.

What is of definite (historical too) importance is the fact that Einstein had recognized many of these problems of physical nature [12] with his (makeshift) approach. Of relevance here are his penetrating remarks [13] (p. 675): *Maxwell's theory of the electric field remained a torso, because it was unable to set up laws for the behavior of electric density, without which there can, of course, be no such thing as an electromagnetic field. Analogously the general theory of relativity furnished then a field theory of gravitation, but no theory of the field-creating masses. (These remarks presuppose it as self-evident that a field theory may not contain any singularities, i.e., any positions or parts in space in which the field-laws are not valid.)*

It is also of relevance to note here that Einstein's numerous attempts at unified field theory did not impress others [25]. For example, Pauli demanded [10] (p. 347) to know what had become of the perihelion of Mercury, the bending of light etc. Einstein was not overly bothered that there were no good answer to these questions in his unified field theory. He wrote "Nearly all the colleagues react sourly to the theory because it puts again in doubt the earlier general relativity." (Was he ready to *completely* abandon his *earlier* general relativity?)

The cases mentioned by Pauli are, clearly, the "pathological cases" in which related mathematical expressions for the explanations of concerned phenomena "agree" with observations. But, for the reasons mentioned earlier, the "correct explanations" of the same cannot be those provided by the makeshift field equations [12]. It is decisive to recognize this fact.

In Einstein's conceptions of dynamic curved geometry, the continuum is no longer only an "inert" stage for the physical fields, different mathematical structures on the continuum. *The defining structure of the continuum must change as these physical structures defined on it change.* In a sense, therefore, the defining structure and the physical fields need to be *inseparable* in any mathematical formulation of these ideas.

Then, to reemphasize the same point once again, we reiterate that, as per Einstein's these conceptions of curved geometry and matter, *the metric structure, the defining structure of the continuum, must change as the physical fields on it change. Therefore, what we need here is some mathemati-*

cal formulation of these ideas in which the physical fields and the metric structure become essentially inseparable from each other. (But, this above is clearly not the situation with Einstein's makeshift field equations with matter since matter-free equations are *obtainable* from them [26])

Now, as per Einstein's conceptions, *the space is to be indistinguishable from physical bodies.* Thus, properties of physical bodies are the properties of the space and vice versa. As any physical body *changes*, these properties change, it then also being a change in the structure of the space.

The question is now of suitable mathematical description of these (Einstein's and Descartes's) conceptions [5]. On very general grounds, such a mathematical description can be expected to possess the following characteristics.

Clearly, in this description, motion of a physical body will be a change in the structure of the space. Cartan's volume-form should then be well-defined at every spatial location. A point of space could also be prescribed, in some suitable non-singular sense, the inertia, electric charge etc. Then, such a point of the space is describable as a point particle in the newtonian sense. We may also look at any *extended* physical body in the newtonian, non-singular, sense of a point particle possessing various properties of a physical body. Thus, physical bodies should *everywhere in space* be describable as singularity-free.

The issue is of incorporating time in this framework and, the temporal evolution of "points of space" is a mathematically well-definable concept - as a dynamical system.

Then, concepts under consideration could be realizable in some mathematically well-defined formalism that deals with dynamical systems defined on continuum as the underlying set.

Such a description then also follows the principle of general covariance: the laws regarding physical objects in it are based on the arbitrary transformations of coordinates of the underlying space and also on time as an essentially arbitrary parameter of the dynamical system.

The question now is of suitable mathematical structure on the space that allows us the association of physical properties of material objects to the points of the space. Furthermore, the question is also of defining in a natural manner the boundary of any physical object.

A physical object has associated with it various (fundamental) physical properties, *eg*, (rest) energy. Then, the adjacent objects clearly separate by boundaries at which the spatial derivative(s) of that property under consideration, (*eg*, rest energy), change(s) the sign.

But, any physical object is some *region of space.* Therefore, some suitable structure on the space must, as per these conceptions, then possess a similar property of its derivative changing its sign at a boundary of a physical object.

It then also follows that a physical property can, essentially, be specified *independently* for each spatial direction since these directions are to be treated as *independent* of each other. This is an immediate consequence of the fact that, as per Einstein's conceptions, properties of the space are also the properties of physical objects.

Now, the space (continuum) is characterizable by "distance" separating its points. Suitable "distance" function can then be expected [27] to possess the property of its derivative(s) changing sign across boundaries separating regions of space corresponding to separated objects. This suitable distance function then, mathematically, becomes a pseudo-metric function on the space, remaining a metric function within a region.

An obvious question is then of suitable such pseudo-metric function on the underlying space, evidently, a continuum.

At the present juncture, we seek an answer to this question in the properties of physical matter. Then, we note that physical matter can be assembled (and reassembled) to produce (another form of) physical matter. Since there is to be "no space without physical matter" in the present situation, it then follows that the underlying space must be mass-scale independent and, hence, spatial-scale independent as well. This, in general, leads us to a space admitting three linearly independent (spatial) homothetic Killing vectors [14].

Consider therefore a three-dimensional pseudo-Riemannian manifold, denoted as $\mathbf{B}$, admitting a pseudo-metric [14]:

$$d\ell^2 = P'^2 Q^2 R^2\, dx^2 \;+\; P^2 \bar{Q}^2 R^2\, dy^2 \;+\; P^2 Q^2 \tilde{R}^2\, dz^2 \qquad (1)$$

where we have $P \equiv P(x)$, $Q \equiv Q(y)$, $R \equiv R(z)$ and $P' = dP/dx$, $\bar{Q} = dQ/dy$, $\tilde{R} = dR/dz$. The vanishing of any of these spatial functions is a *curvature singularity*, and constancy (over a range) is a *degeneracy* of (1).

A choice of functions, say, P_o, Q_o, R_o is a specific distribution of "physical properties" in the space of (1). As some "region" of physical properties "moves" in the space, we have the original set of functions changing to the "new" set of corresponding functions, say, P_1, Q_1, R_1.

Clearly, we are considering the isometries of (1) while considering "motion" of this kind. Then, we will remain within the group of the isometries of (1) by restricting to the triplets of *nowhere-vanishing*

functions P, Q, R. We also do not consider any degenerate situations for (1).

If we denote by ℓ the pseudo-metric function corresponding to (1), then $(\mathbf{B}, \ell)$ is an uncountable, separable, complete pseudo-metric space. If we denote by d, a metric function canonically [15] obtainable from the pseudo-metric (1), then the space $(\mathbf{B}, d)$ is an uncountable, separable, complete metric space. If Γ denotes the metric topology induced by d on $\mathbf{B}$, then $(\mathbf{B}, \Gamma)$ is a Polish topological space. Further, we also obtain a Standard Borel Space $(\mathbf{B}, \mathcal{B})$ where $\mathcal{B}$ denotes the Borel σ-algebra of the subsets of $\mathbf{B}$, the smallest one containing all the open subsets of $(\mathbf{B}, \Gamma)$ [16].

Since $(\mathbf{B}, \mathcal{B})$ is a standard Borel space, any measurable, one-one map of $\mathbf{B}$ onto itself is a Borel automorphism. Therefore, the Borel automorphisms of $(\mathbf{B}, \mathcal{B})$, forming a group, are natural for us to consider here.

But, the pseudo-metric (1) is a metric function on certain "open" sets, to be called the P-sets, of its Polish topology Γ. A P-set of $(\mathbf{B}, d)$ is therefore never a singleton subset, $\{\{x\} : x \in \mathbf{B}\}$, of the space $\mathbf{B}$. Note also that every open set of $(\mathbf{B}, \Gamma)$ is *not* a P-set of $(\mathbf{B}, d)$.

Any two P-sets, P_i and P_j, $i, j \in \mathbf{N}$, $i \neq j$, are, consequently, *pairwise disjoint subsets* of $\mathbf{B}$. Also, each P-set is, in own right, an uncountable, complete, separable, metric space.

Evidently, *a P-set is the mathematically simplest form of "localized" physical properties in the space* $\mathbf{B}$ and we call it a *physical particle*. This suggests that suitable mathematical properties of a P-set, as well as those of a collection of P-sets, can be the properties of physical matter.

Now, *(Lebesgue) measures* on *measurable* subsets of a standard Borel space are *natural* for us to consider here. Also, *signed* measures are definable on measurable sets. Signed measures then provide us the notion of the "polarity" of certain properties. *Measures* could then represent *physical propoerties* in the present formalism.

Now, P-sets, also open in Γ, are *measurable* subsets of $\mathbf{B}$. Thus, we associate with every attribute of a *physical body*, a suitable class of (Lebesgue) measures on such P-sets. Hence, a P-set is a *physical particle*, always an *extended body*, since a P-set cannot be a singleton subset of $\mathbf{B}$.

Clearly, various physical properties (measures) *change* only when the region of space (P-set) changes. Thus, a region of space (P-set) and physical properties (the measures on P-sets) have been amalgamated into one thing here.

Moreover, a given measure can be integrated over the underlying P-set in question. The integration procedure is always a well-defined one for obvious mathematical reasons. The value of such an integral provides then an "averaged quantity characteristic of a P-set" under question. It is then evident that this "average" is a property of the entire P-set under consideration and, hence, of *every point* of that P-set.

A point of the P-set is then thinkable as having these averaged properties of the P-set and, in this precise non-singular sense, is thinkable as a (newtonian) *point-particle* possessing those averaged properties. In this non-singular sense, points of the space $\mathbf{B}$ become point particles.

In essence, we have, in a non-singular manner, then "recovered" the (newtonian) notion of a point particle from that of our notion of a field - the underlying continuum $\mathbf{B}$.

Further, the "location" of this point-particle will be *indeterminate* over the *size* of that P-set because the averaged property is also the property of every point of the set under consideration. The individuality of a point particle is then that of the corresponding P-set.

Now, we call as *an object* a collection of P-sets. But, a P-set is a particle. Therefore, an *object* is a *collection* of particles. Measures can also be integrated over such objects. Such integrated measures are then the property of every point of that object under consideration and a point of $\mathbf{B}$ in the object is then also thinkable as a (newtonian) point particle with these physical properties [28]. Location of such a point particle is then indeterminate over the size of that object.

Then, the points of the underlying space $\mathbf{B}$ can also be attributed the physical properties averaged over the size of an object. Hence, we can also represent an object under consideration as a (newtonian) point particle.

Therefore, we have the required characteristics of Descartes's and Einstein's conceptions incorporated in the present formalism. Clearly, we have then the non-singular notion of a point particle as well as that of replacing any extended physical body by such a non-singular point particle. Furthermore, physical bodies are also represented as non-singular regions of the space $\mathbf{B}$. Then, the union of the space and the physical objects is clearly perceptible here.

As any Borel automorphism of the underlying space $\mathbf{B}$ changes a P-set/object, the integrated properties may also change and, hence, the (initial) particle(s) may change into other particle(s), if integrated measures change.

Now, the *Hausdorff metric* [15] provides the distance separating P-sets and also the distance separating objects. This distance bewteen sets will, henceforth, be called the *physical distance* between P-sets or objects (as extended physical bodies) because "measurement in the physical sense" can be

expected to yield only this quantity as distance separating physical objects.

Measure-preserving Borel automorphisms of the space $\mathbf{B}$ then "transform" a P-set maintaining its characteristic classes of (Lebesgue) measures, that is, its physical properties.

Non-measure-preserving Borel automorphisms change the characteristic classes of Lebesgue measures (physical properties) of a P-set while "transforming" it. Evidently, such considerations also apply to objects.

Then, a *periodic* or *periodic component of* Borel automorphism [16] will lead to an *oscillatory motion* of a P-set or an object while preserving or not preserving its measures.

Therefore, an object undergoing periodic motion is a physically realizable clock in the present framework. Such an object undergoing oscillatory motion then "displays" the time-parameter of the corresponding (periodic) Borel automorphism since the period of the motion of such an object is precisely the period of the corresponding Borel automorphism. (*It is however not the "observed" time since we 'need' here the means to 'observe' the periodic motion of the object.*)

Then, within the present formalism, a *measuring clock* is therefore any P-set or an object undergoing *periodic motion*. A P-set or an object can also be used as a *measuring rod*.

Therefore, in the present theoretical framework, measuring apparatuses, measuring rods and measuring clocks, are on par with every other thing that the formalism intends to treat.

A Borel automorphism of $(\mathbf{B}, \mathcal{B})$ may change the physical distance resulting into "relative motion" of objects. We also note here that the sets invariant under the specific Borel automorphism are characteristic of that automorphism. Hence, such sets will then have their distance "fixed" under that Borel automorphism and will be stationary relative to each other.

Now, in a precise sense, it follows that the position of the point-particle (of integrated characteristics of its P-set) is "determinable" more and more accurately as the size of that P-set gets smaller and smaller. But, complete localization of a point particle is not permissible here since a P-set or an object is never a singleton subset of $\mathbf{B}$. The location of the point particle is then always "indeterminate" to the extent of the size of its P-set. This is an intrinsic indeterminacy that cannot be overcome in any manner.

Hence, a joint manifestation of Borel automorphisms of the space $(\mathbf{B}, \mathcal{B})$ and the association, as a point particle, of integrated measures definable on a P-set or an object with the points of $\mathbf{B}$ is a candidate reason behind Heisenberg's indeterminacy relations since indeterminacy of location of a point-particle is intrinsic here.

In this context, we therefore note that any experimental arrangement to determine a physical property of a P-set or an object is based on some specific "arrangement" of P-sets and involves corresponding Borel automorphisms of $\mathbf{B}$ affecting those P-sets or objects.

For example, Heisenberg's microscope attempting the determination of the location of an electron involves the collision of a photon with an electron. It therefore has an associated Borel automorphism producing the motion of a specific P-set, a photon. Although we have not specified the sense in which a P-set can be a photon, it is clear that the Borel automorphism causing its motion will also affect an electron as a P-set.

Thus, a P-set "transforms" as a result of our efforts to "determine any of its characteristic measures" since these "efforts or experimental arrangements" are also Borel automorphisms, not necessarily the members of the class of Borel automorphisms keeping invariant that P-set (as well as the class of its characteristic measures).

Hence, a Borel automorphism (experimental arrangement) "determining" a characteristic measure of a P-set changes, in effect, the very quantity that it is trying to determine. This peculiarity then leads to Heisenberg's (corresponding) indeterminacy relation.

As another example, consider a physical clock. In the present context, it is an object undergoing periodic motion, with the period of its motion being *exactly* that of the corresponding periodic Borel automorphism. However, to be able to determine this time period of the physical clock, we need the "interaction" of another agency, say, a photon, with the clock, and that interaction is another Borel automorphism. This "interaction" of observing agency causes the "change" in the period of the clock and, hence, leads to the corresponding indeterminacy relation.

Once again, we have not specified the sense in which a P-set can be a photon here. However, it follows that this "sense" is precisely that of measures definable on a P-set of the underlying continuum space $\mathbf{B}$. Here, we therefore need to "define clearly" the classes of measures corresponding to a photon and an electron and, we have obviously not done that here.

However, irrespective of this obvious question of only mathematical nature, it is clearly possible to intuitively explain [17] the origin of Heisenberg's indeterminacy relations. The formalism of dynamical systems on the Borel space $\mathbf{B}$ then provides us therefore an "origin" of Heisenberg's indeterminacy relations. This is in complete contrast to their

probabilistic origin as advocated by the standard formalism of the quantum theory.

Notice now that, in the present considerations, we began with none of the fundamental considerations of the concept of a quantum. But, one of the basic characteristics of the conception of a quantum, Heisenberg's indeterminacy relation, emerged out of the present formalism.

Furthermore, in the present framework, we have also done away with the "singular nature" of the particles and, hence, also with the unsatisfactory dualism of the field (space) and the source particle. We also have, simultaneously, well-defined laws of motion (Borel automorphisms) for the field (space) and also for the well-defined conception of a point particle (of integrated measure characteristics of a P-set or an object). Then, the present formalism is a *complete* field theory.

However, none of the two notions of location and momentum is any deficient for a description of the facts since Heisenberg's indeterminacy relations are also "explainable" within the present formalism. This explanation crucially hinges on the fact that the points of the space **B**, as singleton subsets of the space **B**, are never the P-sets. It is only in the sense of associating the measures integrated over a P-set that the points of the space **B** are point particles.

[At this point, we then also note that the Borel automorphisms of **B** need not be differentiable or, for that matter, even continuous. Therefore, the present considerations also use, for the most fundamental formalism of physics, a mathematical structure different than that of the partial differential equations. However, the question of the physical significance of non-differentiable and non-continuous Borel automorphisms of **B** is a subject of independent detailed study.]

Now, any measuring arrangement is conceivable here only as a Borel automorphism of the underlying continuum **B**. It is therefore clear that the measurability of any characteristic of a point particle as defined in the present framework is dependent on the "Borel automorphism" to be used. But, that Borel automorphism changes the very P-set or object of measurement.

The "determined or observed" location of a particle is therefore a *different* conception here. It clearly depends on the Borel automorphism to be used for the measurement. The "observed velocity or momentum" of a particle is then a conception dependent on the notion of the physical distance changing under the action of a Borel automorphism of **B**. Clearly, the coordination of the underlying continuum **B** has nothing whatsoever to do with the measurability here.

This brings us to some most fundamental issues of the physical world, those of the physical description, measurement and causality.

Recall what Bohr [4] had put it so succinctly: *The quantum theory is characterized by the acknowledgement of a fundamental limitation in the classical physical ideas when applied to atomic phenomena. ... the so-called quantum postulate, which attributes to any atomic process an essential discontinuity, or rather individuality, completely foreign to the classical theories. ...*

Bohr [4] continues: *This postulate implies a renunciation as regards the causal spacetime coordination of atomic processes. Indeed, our usual description of physical phenomena is based entirely on the idea that the phenomena concerned may be observed without disturbing them appreciably. This appears, for example, clearly in the theory of relativity, which has been so fruitful for the elucidation of the classical theories. As emphasized by Einstein, every observation or measurement ultimately rests on the coincidence of two independent events at the same spacetime point. Just these coincidences will not be affected by any differences which the spacetime coordination of different observers may exhibit. Now, the quantum postulate implies that any observation of atomic phenomena will involve an interaction with the agency of observation not to be neglected. Accordingly, an independent reality in the ordinary physical sense can neither be ascribed to the phenomena nor to the agencies of observation. ...*

Indeed, the quantum theory has taught us that the interaction of an observing mechanism with the object being observed causes "uncontrollable" changes to that object of observation. This is an entirely *new element* that was not present either in Newton's theory or in special relativity. This *new element* definitely signifies a fundamental limitation of the related ideas.

To illustrate this above issue, Heisenberg [1] thus wrote that: *In fact, our ordinary description of nature, and the idea of exact laws, rests on the assumption that it is possible to observe the phenomena without appreciably influencing them. To coordinate a definite cause to a definite effect has sense only when both can be observed without introducing a foreign element disturbing their interrelation. The law of causality, because of its very nature, can only be defined for isolated systems, and in atomic physics even approximately isolated systems cannot be observed.*

In his exposition of Bohr's concept of complementarity, Heisenberg [1] then, rightfully, pointed out that: *Second among the requirements traditionally imposed on a physical theory is that it must explain all phenomena as relations between objects existing in space and time. This requirement has*

suffered gradual relaxation in the course of the development of physics.

In this connection, Bohr [4] wrote that: *This situation has far reaching consequences. On one hand, the definition of the state of a physical system, as ordinarily understood, claims the elimination of all external disturbances. But, in that case, according to the quantum postulate, any observation will be impossible, and, above all, the concepts of space and time lose their immediate sense. On the other hand, if in order to make observation possible we permit certain interactions with suitable agencies of measurement, not belonging to the system, an unambiguous definition of the state of the system is naturally no longer possible, and there can be no question of causality in the ordinary sense of the word. ...*

He added [4] further that: *Just as the relativity theory has taught us that the convenience of distinguishing sharply between space and time rests solely on the smallness of the velocities ordinarily met with compared to the velocity of light, we learn from the quantum theory that the appropriateness of our usual causal spacetime description depends entirely upon the small value of the quantum of action as compared to the actions involved in ordinary sense perceptions.*

Heisenberg [1] too had, similarly, stated that: *Although the theory of relativity makes the greatest of demands on the ability for abstract thought, still it fulfills the traditional requirements of science in so far as it permits a division of the world into subject and object (observer and observed) and hence a clear formulation of the law of causality. This is the very point at which the difficulties of the quantum theory begin.*

Furthermore, Bohr [4] also mentioned: *Strictly speaking, the idea of observation belongs to the causal spacetime way of description. ... According to the quantum theory, just the impossibility of neglecting the interaction with the agency of measurement means that every observation introduces a new uncontrollable element.*

Surely, there is absolutely no way of going back to the newtonian strict causality *simultaneously* with its associations of physical properties of objects and the underlying space.

Now, these references to "the relativity theory" are clearly directed at special relativity and emphasize that the Lorentz transformations involve space and time coordinates on equal footing in the 4-dimensional Minkowski manifold.

But, these considerations then ignore the fact that there is, physically speaking, really nothing sacrosanct about the 4-dimensionality in special relativity. Then, we also note at this place that no adequate recognition of Einstein's and Descartes's ideas (about physical matter and geometry) is evident in these above remarks as well as in related discussions by Bohr and by Heisenberg, both. These ideas have definitely changed the newtonian concept of "all phenomena as relations between objects existing in space and time" since their conceptual framework is based on the inseparable unison of physical objects and the space - physical objects are the space and vice versa.

For this last reason, the issues involved herein may also *not* be so simple and straightforward as appears from the above remarks [1, 4]. This situation forces us to reconsider some contents, while still maintaining the validity of other contents, of these remarks [1, 4].

Firstly, it is vital to recognize that the aforementioned *new element* has a direct bearing only on the "observability" of involved quantities but the ensuing limitation does *not* apply to the *association* of the properties of a physical body with the properties of the space. Observability and these associations are independent issues.

To illustrate this point further, let us consider that an observer chooses a certain spatial location as the origin of the coordinate system and intends to attach *spatial labels* to other points of the space with respect to it. To achieve this, the observer needs to use a *measuring rod*.

The observer intends to also attach suitable *temporal labels* to each point of the space. For this purpose, the observer then needs to place at each location in the space physical bodies executing periodic motion as *clocks*.

But, by the quantum postulate, these concepts involve *intrinsic* indeterminacies. Therefore, neither the origin of the coordinate system nor the coordinate labels can be determined in a *physical measurement* any more accurately than permitted by Heisenberg's relevant indeterminacy relation. It is therefore that the coordination used by an observer is not the same as the coordination of the underlying continuum.

Then, in our considerations, the Hausdorff metric, and not the pseudo-metric (1), is clearly the only which is relevant to the coordination used by an *observer*. That is to say, the coordination of the space $\mathbf{B}$ has no direct bearing on the coordination used by an observer.

Furthermore, the association of physical properties, measures on the P-sets or objects, with the underlying space, the space $\mathbf{B}$, has nothing whatsoever to do with the "observability" of these properties by an observer. Observability rests, clearly, on the (group of) Borel automorphisms of the underlying continuum $\mathbf{B}$. Observability and the association of physical properties with the underlying space are therefore entirely unrelated issues for our

considerations here. It is clearly decisive to recognize this independence of these issues.

Now, physical measurement involves the coincidence of two "events" at the *same space* location as far as the coordination of the space **B** is concerned and at the same "time" as far as the "labelling parameter" of the corresponding Borel automorphism of the space **B** is concerned. But, no observer can bypass the natural limits specified by the indeterminacy relations.

Hence, Einstein's point that every measurement rests on the coincidence of two independent events at the same spacetime point should really be viewed as a statement about the coordination of the underlying continuum **B**. Then, it also follows that these coincidences will not be affected by the differences in the spacetime coordination used by different observers.

Then, Einstein's arguments [4] about the spacetime coincidence of two events apply in that two independent events, as far as the coordination of the underlying continuum is concerned, occur at the same space point and at the same time. But, Bohr [4] is equally well justified in pointing out that the quantum postulate renders "measurability" of the values of (spacetime) coordinates *indeterminate* within the natural limits specified by Heisenberg's indeterminacy relations. This dichotomy is evident in the formalism here.

Presently, it is equally vital to also recognize that *the basic ideas of general relativity, of the inseparable unison of physical matter and curved geometry, do* not *imply any assertion that its coordinates, coordinate differences and even the invariant geometric distance are* exactly measurable *physical quantities*. Then, the concepts of underlying curved geometry are *independent* of those of physical measurements. The physical meaning attached to the geometric invariant distance is then, decisively, also lost.

Importantly, the present formalism of dynamical systems on space **B** follows the "strict determinism" in the obvious sense that the space coordinates map *exactly* under the action of a Borel automorphism of the space **B**.

However, it is equally important to realize that this is *not* the same "causality" as that of the newtonian physical formulation since the present formulation must necessarily satisfy Heisenberg's indeterminacy relations.

In this connection, we note that the strict newtonian causality implies that given precise position and velocity of a particle at a given moment and all the forces acting on it, we can predict the precise position and velocity of that particle at any later moment using appropriate (classical) laws - Newton's laws. Then, this newtonian causality is gone for good with the realization that the quantum postulate [4] must hold always.

In our present formalism, the newtonian causality would have demanded that the position and the velocity of a point-particle (definable in the present formalism as a point of the P-set or an object with associated integrated measures) be exactly determinable. This is, evidently, not the situation in the present formalism of dynamical systems on the underlying continuum **B**.

But, *reality independent of any act of observation*, is then ascribable to the phenomena as well as to the agencies of observation in this formalism. Since physical objects are the regions of the space and vice versa, the "existence" of the points of the space is the "existence" of physical objects. This "existence" is, obviously, independent of any act of observation. *Objective reality* of physical phenomena is then explainable similarly. That this is doable in a mathematically and physically consistent manner is now evident.

Clearly, the Moon of the Mother Earth then "exists" whether we choose to look at it or not! But, evidently now, by choosing to look at it, we do also change the gross or average physical characteristics of the Moon as well!

Furthermore, to coordinate a definite cause to a definite effect has appropriate sense in the present formalism. The Borel automorphism of the space **B** is the *cause* behind a certain effect on the P-set or an object. It is therefore not that the idea of *exact laws* rests entirely on the assumption that it is possible to observe the phenomena without appreciably influencing them.

Then, the present formalism of dynamical systems on the underlying continuum **B** allows us a clear division of the world into act of observation and observed. It is this subject-object division that is behind the *law of causality* of the present formalism. But, resolutions of the difficulties of the quantum are already incorporated into the present formalism in that the associations of physical properties with the underlying space **B** embody the indeterminacy relations.

The present formalism, of the dynamical systems of the underlying continuum **B***, is then, already, a unification of the quantum theory and the general theory of relativity.*

[By the "General Theory of Relativity," we of course do not mean here the standard formulation in terms of the Einstein makeshift field equations. We, rather, mean here the underlying ideas of the inseparable unison of physical objects and the space which necessarily require the *generality* of coordinate transformations.

Similarly, by the "quantum theory," we do not mean here the standard formulation in terms of the

Ψ-function but only the underlying ideas implied by Bohr's quantum postulate.

It is a separate and important issue as to how one would recover these standard formulations from the present framework of dynamical systems of the space **B**.]

In what follows, we now provide further heuristic reasons as to why this unification can be considered "natural" in a definite sense.

Recall that the standard formalism of the quantum theory based on Schrödinger's Ψ-function provides us, essentially, the means of calculating the probability of a physical event involving physical object(s). It presupposes that we have specified, say, the lagrangian or, equivalently, certain physical characteristics of the problem under consideration. Evidently, this is necessary to determine the Ψ-function using which we then make (probabilistic) predictions regarding that physical phenomenon under consideration.

At this stage, we then note the following fundamental limitation of any theory that uses probabilistic considerations. (This limitation is clearly recognizable for statistical mechanics in relation to the newtonian theory.)

The pivotal point here is that the method of calculating the probability, say, of the outcome of the toss of a coin, *per se*, cannot provide us the physical description or characterization of what we mean by that coin, whose certain *intrinsic* properties must be specified before hand. That is to say, the method of obtaining the probability of the outcome of its toss is irrelevant to certain intrinsic properties of the coin.

Therefore, methods of the standard quantum theory, these leading us to the probability of the outcome of a physical experiment about a chosen physical object, cannot provide us the means of "specifying" certain intrinsic properties of that physical body. This fact, precisely, appears to be the reason as to why we had to *specify by hand* the values of the mass and the charge in various operators of the non-relativistic as well as relativistic versions of the quantum theory.

The "origins" of "intrinsic" properties of physical bodies cannot then be explainable on the basis of the Ψ-function or by employing the standard methods of the quantum theory.

It is then equally decisive to recognize also that this *intrinsic* limitation of probabilistic considerations cannot, in any manner, be circumvented by *redefining* probability [29].

Essentially therefore, the standard formulation of the quantum theory *presupposes* then that we have *specified* certain intrinsic properties of physical object(s) under consideration. Hence, the origin of such properties is to be sought elsewhere and not within the formalism of the quantum theory. [This is then also why the formalism of quantum theory as well its inherently probabilistic considerations cannot provide the *universal* basis for physics, in general.]

If not within the standard formalism of the quantum theory then, how else can we "explain" the "origin" of the intrinsic properties of material bodies such as its inertia?

In this connection, it is but clear that, in any such explanation, we will have to employ the concept of the space which has been the basis of physical theories since Newton's times. This is necessary not just for the reasons of being able to connect with the ideas of the past but also for the fact that no other avenues appear to be available. Then, Descartes's and Einstein's ideas of the inseparable unison of physical bodies and the properties of the space become open for exploration.

Of course, there cannot be "source particles" as separate or fundamentally independent physical entities in a complete field theory. Particles can only be represented as special regions of field energy in the space and, as per Descartes's and Einstein's ideas, the space itself is the field. The properties of the space are then the properties of material bodies and vice versa. These conceptions, together with certain physically motivated observations related to the mass-scale or the length-scale independence of the space, then lead us uniquely to the pseudo-metric space **B**.

We are then led to the approach of *measures* definable on the pseudo-metric 3-continuum **B** to represent points of the continuum as particles with properties as the integrated measures defined on the corresponding P-sets or objects. Except in this sense of the points of the P-sets or objects of the space **B**, it is not clear as to whether we can, in any other alternative manner, "mathematically" recover the non-singular, physical, notion of a particle to represent material bodies. In the absence of any other alternatives, these concepts related to dynamical systems on the space **B** then become logical compulsion.

In conclusion, from the considerations of the present paper, conceptions related to dynamical systems on the space **B** appear logically inevitable. The unification of the conceptions of the quantum theory and those of the general theory of relativity as embodied in the formalism of the dynamical systems on the space **B**, then, becomes *natural* from this point of view.

[1] Heisenberg W (1949) *The Physical principles of the quantum theory* (Dover, New York)

[2] A classic reference is: Cartan E (1923) *Ann. Ec. Norm.*, **40**, 325; (1924) **41**, 1

[3] See, for example, Goldstein H (1950) *Classical Mechanics* (John Wiley & Sons, New York)
Kibble T W B (1970) *Classical Mechanics* (ELBS-McGraw-Hill, London)
Sudarshan E C G and Mukunda N (1974) *Classical Dynamics - A modern perspective*, (Wiley Interscience, New York)

[4] Bohr N (1928) *Nature (Suppliment Series)*, April 14, 1928, p. 580

[5] Einstein A (1968) *Relativity: The Special and the General Theory* (Methuen & Co. Ltd, London) (See, in particular, Appendix V: Relativity and the Problem of Space.)

[6] Varadrajan V S (1988) *Geometry of quantum theory*, Vol. I and II (Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, New York)

[7] Bohr N (1970) in *Albert Einstein: Philosopher Scientist* (Ed. P A Schlipp, La Salle: Open Court Publishing Company - The Library of Living Philosophers, Vol. VII: 1970)

[8] Jackson J D (1968) *Classical Electrodynamics* (Academic Press)

[9] Dirac P A M (1970) *Principles of Quantum Theory* (Dover, New York)
Scheweber J (1980) *Relativistic Quantum Theory* (McGraw Hill, New York)

[10] Pais A (1982) *Subtle is the Lord ... The science and the life of Albert Einstein* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

[11] See, for example, Weinberg S (1972) *Gravitatioan and Cosmology* (Wiley, New York)
Misner C, Thorne K S and Wheeler J A (1973) *Gravitation* (Freeman, San Francisco)
Davies P C W (1986) *Quantum Fields in Curved Spacetime* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)

[12] Wagh S M (2004) *Einsteinian field theory as a program in fundamental physics* **Database: physics/0404028** and references therein

[13] Einstein A (1970) in *Albert Einstein: Philosopher Scientist* (Ed. P A Schlipp, La Salle: Open Court Publishing Company - The Library of Living Philosophers, Vol VII).

[14] Wagh S M (2004) *Some fundamental issues in General Relativity and their resolution* **Database: gr-qc/0402003** and references therein

[15] Joshi K D (1983) *Introduction to General Topology* (Wiley Eastern, New Delhi)
Lipschutz S (1981) *Theory & Problems of General Topology* (Schaum's Outline Series, McGraw-Hill International, Singapore)

[16] Nadkarni M G (1995) *Basic Ergodic Theory* (Texts and Readings in Mathematics - 6: Hindustan Book Agency, New Delhi) and references therein

[17] Wagh S M (2004) *On the continuum origin of Heisenberg's indeterminacy relations* **Database: physics/0404066**. Submitted to GRG.

[18] This is questioned in quantum theory. See, for example, Bohr [4].

[19] Nothing special about 4-dimensionality. It also existed with Newton's theory. Differences between these two theories, Newton's theory and the Theory of Special Relativity, arise from only the kind of transformations that are being used by them.

[20] Then, we note, in advance, that Einstein's field equations of General Relativity are *not* classical in the sense just described and Einstein did state this fact in [13].

[21] This is, of course, questioned in the quantum theory. At a later stage, we reconsider penetrating remarks by Bohr, Heisenberg and related issues.

[22] This will, in general, be true as long as there exists some procedure for "prescribing by hand" these quantities in the adopted mathematical formalism of any physical character. The question then arises whether the formalism of the quantum theory can provide a procedure of *not* prescribing these quantities *by hand*.

[23] It is then definitely very interesting to note here that Einstein, in the early 1940s, had shown interest [10] (p. 347) in this question.

[24] This 4-dimensional approach appears "natural" because Lorentz transformations appear natural in any comprehension of various physical implications of Maxwell's equations, their invariance relative to the transformations of the underlying metrically flat 4-continuum - the Minkowski continuum, now. But, we must also note that the same can be treated, equivalently, in a 3+1 fashion.

[25] For example, Pauli [10] (p. 347) wrote *[Einstein's] never failing inventiveness as well as his tenacious energy in the pursuit of [unification] guarantees us in recent years, on the average, one theory per annum. ... It is psychologically interesting that for some time the current theory is usually considered by its author to be the "definitive solution."*

[26] To quote Pais [10] (p. 287): "Einstein never said so explicitly, but it seems reasonable to assume that he had in mind that the correct equations should have no solutions at all in the absence of matter." It is but clear now as to why this should be the case with the correct equations.

[27] This is a "necessary" consequence of these conceptions. We can, of course, choose the defining property (of a physical object) itself as a "distance" function.

[28] That we are able to perform these operations is to be attributed to the mass-scale or length-scale invariance.

[29] As a historical interest, we then note here that, during the entire period of the development of the standard formalism of the quantum theory, Einstein had showed [10] no interest in attempts at redefining probability.